



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/785,191	02/25/2004	Norihito Fujita	040405-0367	7417
22428 7590 10/14/2008 FOLEY AND LARDNER LLP SUITE 500 3000 K STREET NW WASHINGTON, DC 20007				
EXAMINER				
RICHARDSON, THOMAS W				
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
2444				
MAIL DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
10/14/2008		PAPER		

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

### Office Action Summary

**Application No.**

10/785,191

**Applicant(s)**

FUJITA ET AL.

**Examiner**

THOMAS RICHARDSON

**Art Unit**

2444

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --  
**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 27 June 2008.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 18, 20, 22-27, 47, 49, 54 and 56-58 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 18, 20, 22-27, 47, 49, 54 and 56-58 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

**Attachment(s)**

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_

### **DETAILED ACTION**

Claims 18, 20, 22-27, 47, 49, 54, and 56-58 are pending for examination.

Claims 1-17, 19, 21, 28-46, 48, 50-53, and 55 are cancelled.

Claims 18, 20, 22-24, 26, 27, 47, 49, and 54 are amended.

Claims 18, 20, 22-27, 47, 49, 54, and 56-58 are rejected.

#### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112***

Claims 17, 18, 21, 26, 46, 47, 50, and 53-55 were previously rejected under 35 U.S.C 112. As per reply filed 27 June 2008, the rejection of those claims is withdrawn.

#### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 101***

Claims 46-50 were previously rejected under 35 U.S.C 101. As per reply filed 27 June 2008, the rejection of those claims is withdrawn.

#### ***Response to Arguments***

1. Applicant's arguments filed 27 June 2008 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. Arguments were filed with respect to independent claims 18, 47, and 49, and were directed toward the patentability of the application over cited prior art reference Somasundaram (US 7 334 049). Applicant argues that Somasundaram does not teach the independent claim as amended. Examiner disagrees.
2. More specifically, applicant argues that Somasundaram does not teach controlling the transfer of a packet between a source and destination and including a packet information field made up of at least one of a priority field, logical network identifier, or a logical channel identifier. Examiner disagrees. Somasundaram teaches a network address translator that may rewrite addresses directed to a private node from a

DNS server (column 7, line 63 to column 8, line 6). In addition, Somasundaram further teaches that the transfer of information from the client to the address in the DNS payload has the addresses rewritten and the data is sent through the address translator. Further, Somasundaram teaches that the invention is compatible with ATM networks (column 11, line 10). It is well known in the art that ATM networks utilize virtual channels for transferring data, and the transfer takes places via Virtual Channel Identifier/Virtual Path Identifier (VCI/VPI) pair, which is analogous to the logical channel identifier as claimed. Rejection of independent claim 18 is thus maintained.

3. Rejection of independent claims 47 and 49 are maintained for reasons similar to those of claim 18, and previous rejections of dependent claims are maintained, as well.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102***

4. The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can be found in a prior Office action.

5. Claims 18, 20, 22-26, 47, 49, and 54 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by US 7 334 049, Somasundaram et al.

6. As per claim 18, Somasundaram teaches a packet transfer device for controlling a transfer of a plurality of packets between a client and a destinations, said packet transfer device, comprising

a DNS proxy unit for receiving a name resolution response message transmitted from a name resolution server to said client, said name resolution response message including an IP address corresponding to said destination and one or more packet transfer information fields, and for rewriting a routing table of said DNS proxy unit to

include said IP address and said one or more packet transfer information fields (Figure 4, steps 404 and 406, also column 7, line 63 to column 8, line 6, where a binding is created between the address given by the DNS in the DNS payload and the selected pool address),

wherein said DNS proxy unit is configured to control said transfer of the packets between said client and said destination according to said one or more packet transfer information fields (column 7, line 63 to column 8, line 22, where the data of the DNS payload is rewritten, and the data sent to the address given in the DNS payload is sent through the network address translator and translated before it is sent to either the client or destination), and

wherein said one or more packet transfer information fields include at least one of a packet transfer priority field, a logical network identifier, and a logical channel identifier (column 11, line 10. It is well known in the art that ATM networks utilize virtual channels for transferring data, and the transfer takes places via Virtual Channel Identifier/Virtual Path Identifier (VCI/VPI) pair).

7. As per claim 20, Somasundaram further teaches in response to said name resolution response message, said DNS proxy unit deletes said one or more packet transfer information fields from said name resolution response message before transmitting said name resolution response message to said client (column 8, lines 7-23, where the header and address information is rewritten for a device when an address translation is required. This rewriting necessitates deleting the old information relating to the forwarding address to create a new entry for the address).

8. As per claim 22, Somasundaram further teaches a user information obtaining unit which obtains attribute information regarding a sender of a name resolution request message transmitted from said client to said name resolution server (column 7, lines 31-47, where the NAT receives the DNS request from the Host, which reveals its private address, which is replaced with a source address from the NAT pool), wherein

said DNS proxy unit, upon receiving said name resolution request message, obtains attribute information regarding the sender of said name resolution request message through said user information obtaining unit and transmits said name resolution request message with said attribute information added to said name resolution server (column 7, lines 31-47, where the NAT receives the DNS request from the Host, which reveals its private address, which is replaced with a source address from the NAT pool).

9. As per claim 23, Somasundaram further teaches as an internal element, a user information database in which said attribute information is stored (Figure 6, also column 8, lines 24-48, where the NAT contains a translation database), wherein

said user information obtaining unit obtains said attribute information from said user information database (column 7, lines 31-47, where the NAT receives the DNS request from the Host, which reveals its private address, which is replaced with a source address from the NAT pool, which is the translation database of Figure 6).

10. As per claim 24, Somasundaram further teaches said user information obtaining unit obtains said attribute information from an external database server having a user

information database in which said attribute information is stored (Figure 8, where the memory and processors are separated from the interfaces by a BUS).

11. As per claim 25, Somasundaram further teaches said user information obtaining unit uses a name resolution request message in obtaining said attribute information from said external database server (Figure 4, steps 404 and 406, also column 7, line 63 to column 8, line 6, where a binding is created between the address given by the DNS in the DNS payload and the selected pool address).

12. As per claim 26, Somasundaram further teaches said external database server is a name resolution server externally disposed (Figure 1, also column 7, lines 31-62, where the host 102a sends a name resolution request message to the DNS server 122, which are on different subnetworks).

13. Claims 47 and 49 are substantially the same as claims 18 and 20, directed toward a computer program rather than a system. Somasundaram teaches a computer program product as well as a system (column 3, lines 44-50). For this reason, program claims 47 and 49 are rejected under the same basis as system claims 18 and 20.

14. Claim 54 is substantially the same as claim 18, directed toward a method rather than a system. Somasundaram teaches a method as well as a system (abstract). For this reason, method claim 54 is rejected under the same basis as system claim 18.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

15. Claim 27 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over US 7 334 049, Somasundaram et al as applied to claim 23 above, and further in view of US 7 103 663, Inoue et al.

16. As per claim 27, Somasundaram teaches the packet transfer device as set forth in claim 23

Somasundaram does not teach a user authentication module for maintaining information about a user at a device. Inoue teaches a license management system comprising:

a user authentication unit which identifies and authenticates a user at a client connected to its own node (column 6, lines 19-27, where the information management unit authenticates a user via a user ID), and

a user information updating unit which updates the contents of said user information database based on attribute information regarding said user obtained at the time of authentication (column 6, lines 34-40, where the user information management unit registers personal information supplied by the users in a user database).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to include a user authentication module and database such as that taught by Inoue in a network address translation system such as that taught by Somasundaram. An authentication module and user database would allow a user on a device to access content on the device that may be protected by means of a rights management server (Inoue, column 5, lines 42-44). This would be beneficial in a system such as that taught by Somasundaram, as it would allow a step of authentication for a user prior to that user being able to access, modify, or request addressing information, which is well known in the art to generally be protected data on a device.



17. Claims 56-58 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over US 7 334 049, Somasundaram et al as applied to claims 18, 47, and 54 above, and further in view of US 7 334 048, Guan et al.

18. As per claim 56, Somasundaram does not expressly teach utilizing a priority field in the routing information.

Guan teaches a method and apparatus for updating a route table wherein: one or more packet transfer information fields include a priority field (column 7, lines 20-25, where a priority field may be included in a route table entry).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to include a priority field such as that taught by Guan in a route table and address translator such as that taught by Somasundaram. Somasundaram's address translator serves as a router in addition to address translation, as it transfers packets from a source to a destination. It would be advantageous for an address translator such as that taught by Somasundaram to have a priority field in addition to other routing fields as Guan's does, as priority is a well known routing function.

19. Claim 57 is substantially the same as claim 56, directed toward a computer program rather than a system. Somasundaram teaches a computer program product as well as a system (column 3, lines 44-50). For this reason, program claim 57 is rejected under the same basis as system claim 56.

20. Claim 58 is substantially the same as claim 56, directed toward a method rather than a system. Somasundaram teaches a method as well as a system (abstract). For this reason, method claim 58 is rejected under the same basis as system claim 56.

***Conclusion***

21. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to THOMAS RICHARDSON whose telephone number is (571) 270-1191. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Thursday, 8am-5pm EST.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, William Vaughn can be reached on (571) 272-3922. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

TR

/William C. Vaughn, Jr./  
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2444